Message

From: Gerhard, Sasha [Gerhard.Sasha@epa.gov]

Sent: 9/29/2016 11:17:31 AM

To: Gaines, Jeff [Gaines.Jeff@epa.gov]

Subject: RE: OB/OD - potential for radiological contamination

LOL! Yes, it is early back there! All is well here, although, I'm extra busy not having the hubby around to cook dinner and share bedtime and dog-walking duties with! Fortunately, he comes home on Saturday and hopefully won't travel again for another 3-4 weeks.

Thanks for sending request on to Edie – perfect!

Sasha Gerhard

USEPA, Office of Resource Conservation & Recovery Program Implementation & Information Division, 5303P 703-347-8964 (office) 703-879-8501 (telework)

From: Gaines, Jeff

Sent: Thursday, September 29, 2016 6:47 AM **To:** Gerhard, Sasha < Gerhard. Sasha@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: OB/OD - potential for radiological contamination

Thanks, Sasha!!

I've got to get used to getting emails from you this early!!

Of course it's mid-day where you are!!

Hope all is well, and by now you know I forwarded your suggestion to our contractor.

Thanks!

Jeff Gaines

Phone: 703-308-8655

"The most exciting phrase to hear in science, the one that heralds the most discoveries, is not "Eureka!" (I found it!) but '**That's funny**.'' — <u>Isaac</u> Asimov

"Dulce et Decorum Est Desipere in Loco" — Josiah S. Carberry

From: Gerhard, Sasha

Sent: Thursday, September 29, 2016 6:34 AM **To:** Gaines, Jeff < Gaines. Jeff@epa.gov>

Subject: FW: OB/OD - potential for radiological contamination

Jeff,

Can we talk (email or call?) to the contractor about ensuring that, when they search for contamination, they also look to see whether radiological contamination is/was present at the site? There are a handful of sites with radiological contamination, but it's not prevalent, so I don't want them to possibly overlook it.

Thanks!

Sasha Gerhard
USEPA, Office of Resource Conservation & Recovery
Program Implementation & Information Division, 5303P
703-347-8964 (office)
703-879-8501 (telework)

From: Gerhard, Sasha

Sent: Thursday, September 01, 2016 9:44 AM **To:** Gaines, Jeff < Gaines. Jeff@epa.gov >

Subject: FW: OB/OD - potential for radiological contamination

Hey Jeff,

Just thinking about our kick-off meeting next week...I know that under Task 2 we seek information regarding the contaminants found at the site (i.e. "contamination description" and indicate constituents of concern in parentheses with regard to what we are looking for. Would this meeting be an opportunity for additional clarification such that we say constituents of concern can also include radiological? Radiological likely isn't something that they would know to look for, since it typically isn't found at OB/OD sites (however, there's a handful per Laura's attachment, which we could provide to them).

Sasha Gerhard
USEPA, Office of Resource Conservation & Recovery
Program Implementation & Information Division, 5303P
703-347-8964 (office)
703-879-8501 (telework)

From: Laura Olah [mailto:info@cswab.org]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 3:14 PM
To: Gerhard, Sasha < Gerhard.Sasha@epa.gov>

 $\textbf{Cc:} \ Crosby-Vega, Terri < \underline{Crosby-Vega.Terri@epa.gov}>; Shuster, \ Kenneth < \underline{Shuster.Kenneth@epa.gov}>; Galbraith, \ Michael \\ \textbf{Michael} = \underline{Shuster.Kenneth@epa.gov}>; Galbraith, \ \textbf{Michael} = \underline{Shuster.Kenneth@epa.gov}>$

<<u>Galbraith.Michael@epa.gov</u>>; Gaines, Jeff <<u>Gaines.Jeff@epa.gov</u>>; Abdul-Malik, Norma <<u>Abdul-</u>

Malik.Norma@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: OB/OD - potential for radiological contamination

Hi Sasha,

Your email was a very welcome message - thank you!

In the interim, we had already prepared the attached to help substantiate our recommendation to include radiological wastes, so I updated the opening paragraph and it is provided here for your information.

<u>Please send me an email</u> when you know for sure that radiological wastes will be included in the scope of work for your contractor.

Thanks again!

Laura

Laura Olah, Executive Director Citizens for Safe Water Around Badger (CSWAB) Coordinator, Cease Fire Campaign E12629 Weigand's Bay S, Merrimac, WI 53561 (608)643-3124
info@cswab.org
www.cswab.org
www.twitter.com/CSWAB
www.facebook.com/cswab.org
http://cswab.org/resources/cease-fire-campaign
http://www.facebook.com/ceasefirecampaign/

From: Gerhard, Sasha [mailto:Gerhard.Sasha@epa.gov]

Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 8:09 AM

To: info@cswab.org

Cc: Crosby-Vega, Terri; Shuster, Kenneth; Galbraith, Michael; Gaines, Jeff; Abdul-Malik, Norma

Subject: RE: OB/OD - potential for radiological contamination

Hi Laura,

I have been catching up on emails from being out of the office and haven't seen a response to you. As it stands, we are tasking our contractor to provide any information available regarding the "type" of contamination found at OB/OD sites. We did not list radiological as an example that could be identified, but I don't think it would be a problem to communicate it to the contractor, especially since work has not begun yet.

Regarding an EPA contact for conventional propellant to become contaminated with DU, I'm cc'ing the team; perhaps Ken may know.

Sasha Gerhard USEPA, Office of Resource Conservation & Recovery Program Implementation & Information Division, 5303P 703-347-8964 (P) 703-308-0509 (F)

From: Laura Olah [mailto:info@cswab.org]
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2016 7:33 PM

To: Gerhard, Sasha < Gerhard. Sasha@epa.gov >

Cc: Crosby-Vega, Terri <Crosby-Vega.Terri@epa.gov>; Laura Olah <info@cswab.org>

Subject: OB/OD - potential for radiological contamination

Hi Sasha,

I don't know if radiological contamination is part of your upcoming OB/OD reports, but in reviewing site documents I'm finding that it should be a consideration. For example, during the 1960s and 1970s, Lake City Army Ammunition Plant in Missouri developed, test-fired, and demilitarized munitions that contained licensed radioactive source material as well as non-radioactive munitions. Testing and demilitarization activities involved firing munitions into sand-filled structures called "bullet catchers." Residual solid wastes from these operations (e.g., spent bullet catcher sand, metal debris, munitions constituents, and potential unexploded ordnance [UXO]) were deposited in an area north of the firing range, which became known as "Area 10." In addition to depleted uranium, the waste also exhibited concentrations of leachable lead considered to be hazardous, as well as radioactive UXO. (Source: U.S. Department of Defense, Proposed Plan for No Further Remedial Action With Land Use Controls, LCAAP Area 10 Sand Piles, July 2009.)

While Lake City is a legacy site, there are also contemporary examples. Among the routine operations at the Pantex Plant (TX) that release radionuclides to the environment are sanitization of components at the Burning Ground and Firing Sites. (Sanitization is defined here as the irreversible modification or destruction of a component or part of a component of a nuclear weapon, device, trainer or test assembly, as necessary, to prevent revealing classified or otherwise controlled information, as required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.) The facility estimates that approximately 0.1% of the radiological air emissions from the Pantex Plant facility are produced by sanitization activities conducted at the Burning Ground and Firing Sites. (Source: U.S. Department of Energy/National Nuclear Security Administration, Site Environmental Report, Pantex Plant, 2013.)

On a separate note, who at EPA would be most versed in the potential for conventional propellant to become contaminated with DU (depleted uranium)? The attached indicates that it is possible.

Laura

d

Laura Olah, Executive Director Citizens for Safe Water Around Badger (CSWAB) Coordinator, Cease Fire Campaign E12629 Weigand's Bay S, Merrimac, WI 53561 (608)643-3124

www.cswab.org www.twitter.com/CSWAB

www.facebook.com/cswab.org

http://cswab.org/resources/cease-fire-campaign

http://www.facebook.com/ceasefirecampaign/

